

**Serial No.:** 09/675,619  
**Filed:** September 29, 2000

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of Claims**

Claims 7, 9, 12, 13-17, 20-22 and 25-26 were pending. Claims 9 and 13-15 have been canceled. Claims 7, 12, 16-17, 20-22 and 25-26 are therefore pending.

### **Rejections under 35 USC § 102**

The examiner rejected claims 13-14 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,768,163 ("Smith"). In an effort to expedite prosecution, applicants have canceled these claims. Applicants reserve the right to pursue these claims in a continuation application.

### **Rejections under 35 USC § 103**

The examiner rejected claims 7, 16, and 20-21 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,809,115 ("Inkinen") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,764,693 ("Taylor") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,788,550 ("Chadima"). The examiner further rejected claim 9 as being unpatentable over Inkinen in view of Taylor and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,483,814 ("Hsu"). The examiner further rejected claim 15 as being unpatentable over Smith in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,433,818 ("Steinberg"). Claims 9 and 15 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully traverse the remaining rejections for at least the reason that the motivation to combine the reference teachings is lacking.

To make an obviousness rejection, the examiner must establish a prima facie case. See MPEP 2142. "To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." *Id.* (emphasis added by applicants).

Claim 7 recites in part: "wireless communication circuitry encased in a shell, said shell being a detachable molding element of an electronic device [and an] RF antenna [that] forms a part of a company logo or identifying mark located

**Serial No.: 09/675,619**  
**Filed: September 29, 2000**

on the shell of the wireless network adapter." The examiner cites Inkinen as teaching wireless communication circuitry encased in a shell that is a detachable molding element of an electronic device. The examiner further cites Chadima as teaching an antenna that forms part of a company logo. However, the logo taught in Chadima is a hood ornament of a vehicle, and is not located on the shell of a wireless adapter as required by the claim. Chadima teaches the concealment of an antenna function "to harmonize with the intended aesthetic appearance of the automobile" and to prevent vandalism. Col. 1, lines 38-45. There is no suggestion provided by the examiner, Chadima, or the other references, that an antenna of a wireless adapter is aesthetically undesirable or prone to induce vandalism. The examiner has failed to establish prima facie obviousness absent some motivation to conceal the antenna in accordance with applicants' claimed invention.

For at least this reason, applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is patentable over the cited art. Claims 16 and 20-21 similarly claim an RF antenna that forms part of a company logo on the wireless adapter or some part of a computer system. Applicants submit that these claims are similarly patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons given above.

#### **Allowed Subject Matter**

The examiner has indicated that pending claims 12, 17, 22 and 25-26 are allowed.

#### **Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims. If the examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite the resolution of this case, she is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

In the course of the foregoing discussions, applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may

**Serial No.: 09/675,619**  
**Filed: September 29, 2000**

be other distinctions between the claims and the prior art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

If any fees or time extensions are inadvertently omitted or if any fees have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Hewlett-Packard Company Deposit Account Number 08-2025 and enter any time extension(s) necessary to prevent this case from being abandoned.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Daniel J. Krueger  
PTO Reg. No. 42,771  
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)  
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS